

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

RYAN J. GRIFFIN,

Plaintiff

v.

CIV 09-312 BB/KBM

P. SNEDEKER, Warden,

Defendant.<sup>1</sup>

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO CONSOLIDATE**

A motion for summary judgment has been filed and is not yet ripe for disposition because Plaintiff was granted a generous extension in which to file his response. *See Docs. 29-32*. After the extension was granted, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking to “merge” this case with another of his lawsuits. *See Doc. 33*. The other suit – *Griffin v. Romero*, CIV 09-0513 WJ/RLP – is presently awaiting Plaintiff’s response to a pending *Martinez* Report, and Plaintiff did not file a motion to consolidate in that action. *See id.* (Doc. 18).

Defendant objects to amendment and consolidation and to-date, Plaintiff has not filed a reply. Defendant’s response thoroughly and persuasively sets out the reasons why the motion should not be granted, and I incorporate that reasoning herein. *See Doc. 34*.

Wherefore,

---

<sup>1</sup> The San Miguel County Detention Center was dismissed at the outset. *See Doc. 11*.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to amend and consolidate (*Doc. 33*) is **denied**.

**IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ORDERED** that the previous briefing schedule stands – Plaintiff shall file his response to the pending motion for summary judgment no later than Wednesday, May 12, 2010, and no further extensions will be granted him absent extraordinary circumstances. Defendant may file a reply, if any, within the time permitted under the rules.

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE